REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action mailed on August 8, 2006, and submit the following remarks. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the following remarks prior to examining the above-referenced patent application after RCE. Claims 1- 14 are pending in this Application.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner disagrees with the Applicants' assertion that Light et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,192,380 ("Light") does not teach, "receiving, at the host computer, a completed online form when the online form contains a modified data item, wherein the first data profile is updated with the modified data item, and wherein the completed online form includes viewable profile data populated from the filtered first data profile portion of the third data set" (emphasis added).

Light discloses a learning unit that determines when the user has entered text into a previously blank field. Thus, the Light system fills the form fields according to the information it has cumulatively collected. Thereafter, if the user enters data in a field that was not previously known, the learning unit retrieves the HTML tag corresponding to the form field and the text that was entered in the field, and saves each to memory. The next time the client side module detects the tag of the newly added field, the field is filled with the corresponding data. While this procedure enables new data to be added to the collection of form fill data elements, **Light does not disclose or suggest the detection of a form field that has been modified.** For example, an HTML tag may exist for an address; however, if the user modifies the text in the address field, Light does not disclose or suggest a mechanism whereby the modification may be detected, and thus, the modified data item would not be updated for subsequent form fills.

Light further discloses a data matching process, which is used to link an unidentified HTML tag from a form to a data item. For example, Light discloses that, "[i]f the data matches information in the database, the process continues to block 595. At block 595, the new tag is added to the list of tags associated with the information found in the database" (col. 7, lines 1-4). In other words, fields may be variously tagged among different forms; therefore, the data item itself can be used to associate the unidentified tag with the appropriate data item. However, only the list of tags associated with the data item is modified and the data item itself is not modified.

Light makes frequent reference to adding a data item to a profile when text is entered into a previously blank field. When a form is submitted that contains a previously blank field that has

been filled, the tag for the field is retrieved and is used to insert the data item into the database with the appropriate tag. Thus, **Light discloses a database "insert" process, however at no point in the disclosure does Light explicitly or implicitly imply an "update" database transaction, which is necessary when updating a previously existing data item with a modified data item.**

Applicants respectfully assert that "'Inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing *may* result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient. '" (quoting *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581 (CCPA 1981))

Those of ordinary skill would appreciate that modifying a data item within a database is not the same as adding a data item that did not previously exist. In fact, the process used to modify data in a database as opposed to adding new data to the database is evidenced by the SQL statements to perform the respective operations. For example, to add data to a database, one may use the following SQL algorithm:

"INSERT INTO table_name (column1, column2,...) VALUES (value1, value2,....)"

However, to update a data item that already exists within the database, the following SQL algorithm may be applied:

"UPDATE "table_name" SET "column_1" = [new value] WHERE {condition}".

It is important to note that individual data items within the profile are not modified (updated) based upon a modification of text within a form field. As generally described above, an HTML tag may have been entered into the database at an earlier time; however, such HTML tag was never associated with a data item. Thus, when the tag for the newly entered data item is matched with a preexisting tag in the database, Light associates the new data item with the preexisting database tag. In other words, the association between the HTML tag and the new data item was completed when the user entered text into the blank form field. Again, **the data item was not itself modified (updated), but was added (inserted).** As such, Light does not disclose or suggest at least, "receiving, at the host computer, a completed online form when the online form contains a modified data item, wherein the first data profile is updated with the modified data item, and wherein the completed online form includes viewable profile data populated from the filtered first data profile portion of the third data set" (emphasis added), as similarly recited by independent claims 1 and 11.

Claims 2-10 and 12-14 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 11, therefore claims 2-10 and 12-14 are allowable for at least the reasons described above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

If the Examiner is not inclined to allow the above claims or is not persuaded by the arguments presented herein, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reference specific portions of the Light reference which disclose updating a preexisting data item in response to a modification of a form field, as opposed to the insertion process as disclosed by Light, wherein only new data items are added to a database.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims properly set forth that which Applicants regard as their invention and are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience, if that would help further prosecution of the subject Application. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814, including any required extension fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 5, 2006   By: _____
                                    Howard Sobelman
                                    Reg. No. 39,038

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
400 E. Van Buren
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Phone: 602-382-6228
Fax: 602-382-6070
Email: hsobelman@swlaw.com